## This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

## BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

## IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.

		AL.	LOWED REVIEW	
Applicati n Number 09/672,898	Art Unit 3641	Notice of Allowance 24-Mar-03	Examiner THOMSON, MICHELLE R	<b>Reviewer</b> Baldwin, Robert
	<b>外外</b> 发化	On	nitted Rejections	
Is there a pot you propose r			ing a rejection? (The rejection	n ● Yes ○ No
If yes, check all ✓ 35 U.S.C.				
☐ 35 U.S.C.	103			
☐ 35 U.S.C.	112, first para	graph, written o	description	
☐ 35 U.S.C.	112, first para	igraph, enablem	nent	
☐ 35 U.S.C.	112, second p	oaragraph		
☐ 35 U.S.C.	101 (utility)			
☐ 35 U.S.C.	101 ( non-sta	tutory subject m	natter)	
☐ Double Pa	tenting (statu	tory, ODP)		
$\Box$ Other (e.g	J., Best Mode)			
			•	
	*			

WALLEY AND SOLETION	ALLOWED, REVI	EW′	434 V. F. 105	18 1 <b>.48</b>
Applicati n Number	N tice Of All wance		Reviewer	
09/672,898	24-Mar-03		Baldwin, Robert	
	Section III. 35 U.S	.C.:102;* ;: -		
Correctness of 35 U.S.C 10	2 Rejections			
Were all 35 U.S.C 102 reject	•		0 0	
(No indicates potentia	l clear error)		○ Yes ○ No	
If no, indicate the problem	(check all that apply)			
$\square$ Claimed features not	found in the reference.			
$\square$ Wrong subsection of	35 U.S.C. 102 used.			
$\square$ Date of the reference	e no good.			
$\square$ Inherency applied im	• • •			
☐ Improper official noti	ce.			
☐ Other				
Comments:			•	
Clarity of 35 U.S.C 102 Rej		_	O	
<del>-</del>	ctions formulated in a clear m	anner?	○ Yes ○ No	
(No indicates potentia	•			
Were claim limitations mate			○ Sometimes ○ I	_
Was any statement of inher	rency clearly explained:	○ Yes	○ Sometimes ○	No ON/A
35 U.S.C 102 Rejection(s)	That Should Have Been Ma	de		
• • • •	ne proposed35 U.S.C. 102 reje		nould have been mad	de:
Claim 6 is fully readable comprising: (a) a plurali provided in each of the bin a shell and fired from	on Winston (4,966,365) which ity of cloth shot bags 68 connected as the Winston a large caliber firearm, the insure that (4,729,279) is noted on the control of the control	shows (see, i.e ected to each ot in device is inhe stant claimed st	e., FIG. 5) a device ther; and (b) metal serently capable of be ructure fails to define	shots 44 ing packed e over such
	he proposed 35 U.S.C. 102 rej	ection(s) above		
of record				
✓ not of record (attach sea)	rch logic/documentation)			:
✓ East	□ EPO	☐ Other		
	□ JPO			į
□ NPL	☐ Derwent	Ĺ		
Comments:				
	s found using the search logic th or fabric) [111 hits].	: metal\$3	same shot and (bag	gs or
			-	

Application Number 09/672,898			<b>Reviewer</b> Baldwin, Robert		
	SECTION XI. File Wrapper			3,41.4	
Reasons for Allowance (R	/A)			· · · · ·	
	Reasons for Allowance (R/A)?	○ <sub>Yes</sub>	No	$\circ_{N/A}$	
If yes,					
Is the R/A clear and co	omplete?	○ Yes	$\circ$ No		
If no,	halo indicate a D/A	$\bigcirc$ $_{v}$	⊙ No		
	hole indicate a R/A was necessary?	∨ Yes	♥ No		
Comments:			<del></del>		
interviews		<b>W</b>			
Was there an interview reaction reviewed?	garding the merits of the case relevant to the	○ <sub>Yes</sub>	⊙ <sub>No</sub>		
If yes,			$\circ$		
Was Summary Form PTOL	•	○ Yes			
Comments:	erview clear and complete?	○ <sub>Yes</sub>	○ No		
Claims Were claims troated in an i	nannranriata mannar an nan cubstantiva issuesi	2 (			
If yes,	nappropriate manner on non-substantive issues	? ○ Yes	No		
claims are present that	at were not addressed.				
	drawn from consideration should have been can	relled			
	laims were not properly treated.	icelled.			
other	dains were not properly treated.				
Comments:					
Sequence Rules					
	nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences?	○ <sub>Yes</sub>	⊙ No		
If yes,	•	163	110		
Did the examiner properly h	andle Sequence Compliance Issues?	$\circ_{Yes}$	○ No		

a silotopiis käänen	ALLOWED REVIEW.			r J. J. Sar.
Applicati n Number 09/672,898	N tice Of Allowance 24-Mar-03		<b>riewer</b> n, Robert	
	Section XIII. Other Issue	5 (1)	的污污	
Were all claims for priority pro	operly treated?	⊚ <sub>Yes</sub>	$\circ_{No}$	$\circ_{N/A}$
If a restriction was made, was	s it proper?	$\circ_{Yes}$	○ <sub>No</sub>	● N/A
Were all matters of substance affidavits/declarations evaluate	e in applicant's response and ted sufficiently?	● <sub>Yes</sub>	○ <sub>No</sub>	O <sub>N/A</sub>
Other issues?		$\circ_{Yes}$	⊙ No	
Comments:			*	
Comments.				

## ALLOWED REVIEW: Reviewer N tice Of All wance Applicati n Number Baldwin, Robert 09/672,898 24-Mar-03 Section XIV: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding Patentability Determination: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding The record developed by the examiner shows an indication of allowable subject matter at the □Yes earliest time which is consistent with the file record and prosecution of the application. Yes Through the rejections and arguments made by the examiner, an appropriate line of patentability is established which results in amendment(s) properly limiting the scope of an □Yes The search record in the application clearly shows that the examiner construes the claimed subject matter in its broadest reasonable interpretation and seeks to develop prior art from the appropriate peripherally related art areas. Action Taking: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding The statements of rejection, objection, and response to arguments clearly and concisely present the $\Box$ Yes positions taken or recommended in the resulting Office actions including a thorough substantive explanation to convey those positions to the applicant. The Office action usually refer an applicant's attention to relevant and helpful elements, figures, ☐ Yes and/or text upon which the Office action relies to support the position taken. □Yes The Office action indicates that the principle of compact prosecution is being fully followed. Note, the principle of compact prosecution comprises conducting an initial search which is as complete as possible including consultation with an expert in the art where the examiner lacks such expertise (see search quidelines); placing art of record which meets both the concept and the wording of the claims as well as other art which is pertinent to significant though unclaimed features of the disclosed invention; and issuing a first Office action which clearly explains the examiner's position on each essential issue in such detail that absent some unexpected consideration the next Office action may be made final. Patent Examining Function: Indicia of Commendable/Outstanding Check one of the following statement if applicable: The Office action is formulated to advance the prosecution, correct other informalities, and develop a complete file wrapper record. The Office action also is such that it leaves little room for improvement. The Office action clearly and concisely presents the positions taken. The entire Office action is complete and accurate and does not require any substantial revision. The Office action effectively conveys the positions taken. Comments:

<b>Application Number</b> 09/672,898	N tice Of All wance 24-Mar-03	<b>Revie</b> Baldwin,		
	Search Search	*		¥-4754
nitial Data Capture Point	s			
Was art provided from an E	SS before first action?	O Yes	O No	
Was any IDS improperly tre	eated?	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	O N/A
Was a text search performe	ed by the Examiner?	Yes	O No	
Was it non-pate	ent literature?	O Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	
Is the search strategy print	out present?	O Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	O N/A
Was the inventorship searc	hed by the Examiner?	O Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	
•	has identified specific search requirements of the above requirements, were these lied with?	in O Yes	O No	● N/A
Were foreign patent docum	ents cited by the Examiner on an 892?	O Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	
Were NPL documents cited	by the Examiner on an 892?	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	
Did the Examiner perform a	new search in a 2nd/subsequent action?	O Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	O N/A
Did the Examiner update al	I searches in a subsequent action?	<ul><li>Yes</li></ul>	O No	O N/A
Did an ESS submit a new search report in a 2nd/subsequent action?			O No	O N/A
Was there new art found by 2nd/subsequent action?	y the Examiner that was applied in a	<ul><li>Yes</li></ul>	O No	O N/A
Has a search been perform	ed by the Reviewer?	<ul><li>Yes</li></ul>	O No	
verall Rating of the Sear	ch			
○ Adequate				
·				
Less than Adequate				
Comments:	d have found Winston (4,966,365) patent.			
Adequate text scaren would	a have round winston (1,500,505) paterie.			